

THE TRIF-WEEKLY COMMONWEALTH.

VOL. 7.

FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY, MAY 24, 1858.

N. 107.

THE TRI-WEEKLY COMMONWEALTH
WILL BE PUBLISHED EVERY MONDAY, WED-
NESDAY, AND FRIDAY,
BY A. G. HODGES,
STATE PRINTER,
At THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, paya-
ble in advance.

THE WEEKLY COMMONWEALTH, a large man-
moth sheet is published every Tuesday morn-
ing at TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, in ad-
vance.

Our terms for advertising, either in the Tri-
Weekly or Weekly Commonwealth, will be as
liberal as in any of the newspapers published in
the west.

All letters upon business should be post-
paid to insure attention.

LAW BOOKS AND BLANKS,
FOR SALE
AT COMMONWEALTH OFFICE.

BOOKS.
MONROE & HARLAN'S DIGEST OF THE DECIS-
IONS OF THE COURT OF APPEALS,
2 vols. Price, \$12 00

KENTUCKY CODES OF PRACTICE,
1 vol. Price, 3 50

REVISED STATUTES OF KENTUCKY,
1 vol. Price, 5 00

DEBATES OF THE CONVENTION,
1 vol. Price, 3 00

GUIDE TO JUSTICES, CLERKS, SHERIFFS,
&c., w/ J. C. HENDERSON,
1 vol. Price, 3 00

ACTS OF THE LEGISLATURE OF KY.,
Session 1853 and 1854—2 vols. Price, 3 00

THE GENERAL ACTS OF Session 1853 and
1854—in Pamphlet form. Price, 1 00

THE GENERAL ACTS of Session 1853 and
1854—in Pamphlet form. Price, 1 50

B. MONROE'S REPORTS.—The 15th, 16th & 17th vols.

John Monroe's Reports, \$5 per volume.

LOUGHBOROUGH'S DIGEST OF THE STAT-
UTES.
1 vol. Price, 3 00

HON. GEO. ROBERTSON'S SPEECH.—*The American
Party, its Principles, its Objects, and its Hopes.*
Pamphlet.—10cts.

HON. GARRETT DAVIS' SPEECHES. Pamphlet.
Price—5cts.

BLANKS,
BLANKS FOR COUNTY COURT JUDGES of all kinds.
Price—5cts per quire.

JUSTICE'S BLANKS—WARRANTS AND EXECU-
TIONS.
Price—60cts per quire.

CONSTABLE'S SALE NOTICE'S, REPLEVIN BONDS
&c.
Price—60cts per quire.

SHERIFF'S REPLEVIN BONDS. Price—60cts per
quire.

CIRCUIT CLERK'S EXECUTIONS. Price—60cts per
quire.

BLANK CHECKS, on Branch Bank of Kentucky, a/
Frankfort, and Farmers' Bank of Kentucky.
Price—\$1 per quire.

BLANK DEEDS. Price—\$1 per quire.

Orders from a distance for any of the above
named Books or Blanks will be promptly attended to
when accompanied by the *Cash*; and if desired to be
forwarded by mail, the postage will be pre-paid upon the
condition that it be refunded by the person ordering
the article to be sent by mail.

FRANKLIN GOIN. A. M. GAZLAY.

GORIN & GAZLAY,
Attorneys and Counselors at Law,
LOUISVILLE, KY.

REFERENCES.

MICHAEL A. TRADE & CO.; GARRET, BELL & CO.;
MCNAUL, TURNER, & HUTCHINSON; LOW,
& WHITNEY; JAS. E. BREED, Esq.; HAYS, CRAIG & CO.;
CARUTH, MRS. & TRIGG; WILSON, STARKEY & SMITH;
CASEY & HOPKINS; CURD & WHITE; ABAT & RAI-
LEY; CURD & CO. [Aug. 17, 1857—45.]

JOHN FLOURNOY,

Attorney at Law, Notary Public,
DEVOTES HIMSELF TO THE
COMMERCIAL & ADMIRALTY PRACTICE,
ST. LOUIS, MO.

COLLECTIONS in all parts of Missouri and Illinois af-
filiated to prompt remittances made, correspond-
ence solicited, and information cheerfully given.

REFERS, BY PERMISSION, TO
THOMAS L. PARSONS, L. L. D., Professor of Law, Cam-
bridge, Mass.

KENNARD & BROTHERS, Merchants, St. Louis.

CROW, MCREEVER & CO., Merchants, St. Louis.

HON. JNO. E. RYLAND, Judge Supreme Court of Mo.

HAYWOOD, CROW & CO., Merchants, St. Louis.

BUCKNER, HARRIS & CO., Merchants, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Sept. 9, 1857—45.

FRANK BEDFORD,
Attorney at Law,
VERSAILLES, KENTUCKY.

Dec. 1, 1856—45.

ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,
Attorney and Counselor at Law,
LEXINGTON, KY.

OFFICE on Short Street between Limestone and
Upper Streets. [May 23, 1856—45.]

THOMAS A. MARSHALL

HAVING removed to Frankfort and resumed the prac-
tice of Law in the Circuit Courts, to such cases as
may be referred to him in the Court of Appeals of Ken-
tucky, and to such engagements as he may make in
other Courts conveniently accessible. He will also give
opinions and advice in writing upon cases stated, well
written, or on records presented to him. He will promptly
attend to all business connected with the practice of the business
above described, and may at all times, except when ab-
sent on business, be found in Frankfort.

March 30, 1857—45.

T. WALL. JOHN W. FINNELL.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
COVINGTON, KY.

OFFICE, THIRD STREET, OPPOSITE SOUTH END CITY HALL.
W. & F. practice in the Courts of Kenton, Campbell,
Grant, Boone, and Nicholas, and the Court of Appeals,
at Frankfort.

May 5, 1856—45.

T. N. LINDSEY,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Frankfort, Ky.

WILL practice in all the Courts held in Frankfort
and the adjoining counties. His Office is at his resi-
dence, near P. Swigert's entrance on Washington street.
Frankfort, Feb. 26, 1849, 751—45.

JOHN RODMAN,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Office on St. Clair Street, next Door to Morse's
Telegraph Office.

WILL practice in all the Courts held in Frankfort, and
in Oldham, Henry, Trimble and Owen counties.
Oct. 29, 1855.

GEORGE W. CRADDOCK,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
FRANKFORT, KY.

OFFICE removed to East side of St. Clair street,
over the Telegraph Office. Will practice Law in all
the Courts held in Frankfort, and adjoining counties.
Dec. 7, 1856—45.

H. KEENON, JNO. N. CRUTCHER.

KEENON & CRUTCHER,
HAVING PURCHASED THE STOCK OF
BOOKS & STATIONERY,

OF H. EVANS, also that of MORRIS & HAMPTON,
will continue to carry on the above business, at the
stand now occupied by H. EVANS on Main street, Frankfort,
by strict attention to business, they hope to merit as well
as receive a liberal share of public patronage.

March 12.

POTATOES & APPLES.

BUSHES Superior Potatoes,
50 bushels fine Apples, instore and/or sale by
Nov. 11, 1857.

GRAY & TODD.

Fashionable Hats.

THE NEW PARIS STYLE OF SILK HAT, JUST
received and for sale at
March 8, 1858.

TODD'S.

HORN & METCALFE,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
FRANKFORT, KY.

YSAENDER HORN and JAS. P. METCALFE,
have formed a partnership for the practice of law
and the collection of claims. Business entrusted
to them will receive prompt attention.

Office the same occupied by Judge Horn, on St. Clair
street. April 28, 1858.

LAW CARD.

H. F. SIMMEL. J. TEVIS.

SIM RALL & TEVIS.
COUNSELLORS AND ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
LOUISVILLE, KY.

1/2 Office on Jefferson Street, opposite the Postoffice
House. [April 23, 1858—45.]

M. D. M'HENRY.

M. D. & W. H. M'HENRY,
ATTORNEYS AND LAND AGENTS,
DES MOINES, IOWA.

DEPOSPOSE to practice in the various Courts of Polk
County, and in the Supreme Court of Iowa, and the
United States District Court.

They have also established a General Agency for the
transaction of all manner of business connected with
Land Titles.

To enter Lands, investigate Titles, buy and sell
lands, and invest money on the best terms and on the
best securities.

They will enter Lands in Kansas and Nebraska Territories
if an amount sufficient to justify a visit to that
country is offered.

The Senior Partner having been engaged extensively
in the business of the law in the Courts of Kentucky for
nearly thirty years, and the Junior having been engaged in
the Land Business in Iowa for eight years past, during
which time he has made a detailed survey of a large
portion of the State, and the boundaries, they feel confident that
they will be able to render a satisfactory account of all busi-
ness entrusted to them.

They will enter Land with Land Warrents or Moneys
upon Actual delivery, and will bill and bill to
the State of Commission, upon a careful investigation of
titles.

Persons wishing to settle in the State can find
desirable farms and city property for sale, by calling
on them at their office in Sherman's Building, corner of
Third street and Court Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa.

March 11, 1857—45.

S. MORRIS,
Attorney and Counselor at Law,
FRANKFORT, KY.

Will practice in all the courts held in Frankfort, and
in the adjoining counties. He will attend particularly
to the collection of debts in any part of the State.
All business confined to him will meet with prompt
attention.

He will enter Lands in Kansas and Nebraska Territories
if an amount sufficient to justify a visit to that
country is offered.

The Senior Partner having been engaged extensively
in the business of the law in the Courts of Kentucky for
nearly thirty years, and the Junior having been engaged in
the Land Business in Iowa for eight years past, during
which time he has made a detailed survey of a large
portion of the State, and the boundaries, they feel confident that
they will be able to render a satisfactory account of all busi-
ness entrusted to them.

They will enter Land with Land Warrents or Moneys
upon Actual delivery, and will bill and bill to
the State of Commission, upon a careful investigation of
titles.

Persons wishing to settle in the State can find
desirable farms and city property for sale, by calling
on them at their office in Sherman's Building, corner of
Third street and Court Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa.

March 11, 1857—45.

MOREHEAD & BROWN,
Partners in the
PRACTICE OF LAW.

Will attend to all business confined to them in the
Court of Appeals, Federal Court, and other Courts
of the State, and all other State Courts held in Frankfort,
and will attend to the collection of debts in any part of the State.
All business confined to him will meet with prompt
attention.

He will enter Lands in Kansas and Nebraska Territories
if an amount sufficient to justify a visit to that
country is offered.

The Senior Partner having been engaged extensively
in the business of the law in the Courts of Kentucky for
nearly thirty years, and the Junior having been engaged in
the Land Business in Iowa for eight years past, during
which time he has made a detailed survey of a large
portion of the State, and the boundaries, they feel confident that
they will be able to render a satisfactory account of all busi-
ness entrusted to them.

They will enter Land with Land Warrents or Moneys
upon Actual delivery, and will bill and bill to
the State of Commission, upon a careful investigation of
titles.

Persons wishing to settle in the State can find
desirable farms and city property for sale, by calling
on them at their office in Sherman's Building, corner of
Third street and Court Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa.

March 11, 1857—45.

JOHN M. HARLAN.
ATTORNEY AT LAW.

FRANKFORT, KY.

Will practice in all the Courts held in Frankfort, and
will attend to the collection of debts in any part of the State.
All business confined to him will meet with prompt
attention.

He will enter Lands in Kansas and Nebraska Territories
if an amount sufficient to justify a visit to that
country is offered.

The Senior Partner having been engaged extensively
in the business of the law in the Courts of Kentucky for
nearly thirty years, and the Junior having been engaged in
the Land Business in Iowa for eight years past, during
which time he has made a detailed survey of a large
portion of the State, and the boundaries, they feel confident that
they will be able to render a satisfactory account of all busi-
ness entrusted to them.

They will enter Land with Land Warrents or Moneys
upon Actual delivery, and will bill and bill to
the State of Commission, upon a careful investigation of
titles.

Persons wishing to settle in the State can find
desirable farms and city property for sale, by calling
on them at their office in Sherman's Building, corner of
Third street and Court Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa.

March 11, 1857—45.

N. D. SMITH.

N. D. SMITH & CO.,
MANUFACTURERS OF

ALCOHOL,
COLOGNE AND PURE SPIRITS.

No. 16 & 18, West side Second St., bet. Main & Market

LOUISVILLE, KY.

August 26, 1857—45.

GEORGE W. GWINN. W. OWEN.

GWIN & OWEN,
Dealers in Hardware and Cutlery,
STORE IN HANNA'S NEW BUILDING,
MAIN STREET,

FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY.

Jan. 30, 1857—45.

CHARLES B. GETZ'S.

NEW TAILORING ESTABLISHMENT.

<p

THE COMMONWEALTH.

SPEECH

OF

Hon. S. A. DOUGLAS,
In Opposition to the Report of the Conference Committee.

Delivered in the United States Senate, April 29th.

MR. DOUGLAS.—Mr. President, I have carefully examined the bill reported by the Committee of Conference as a substitute for the House amendment to the Senate bill for the Admission of Kansas, with an anxious desire to find in it such provisions as would enable me to give it my support. I had hoped that after the disagreement of the two Houses upon this question, some plan, some form of bill, could have been agreed upon which would harmonize and quiet the country, and reunite those who agree in principle and in political action on this great question, so as to take it out of Congress. I am not able, in the bill which is now under consideration, to find that the principle for which I have contended is fairly carried out. The position and the sole position upon which I have stood in this whole controversy, has been that the people of Kansas and of each other Territory, in forming a constitution for admission into the Union as a State, should be left perfectly free to form and mould their domestic institutions and organic act in their own way, without coercion on the one side, or any improper or undue influence on the other.

The question now arises, is there such a submission of the Lecompton constitution as brings it fairly within that principle? In terms the constitution is not submitted at all; but yet we are told that it amounts to a submission, because there is a land grant attached to it, and they are permitted to vote for the land grant, or against the land grant; and, if they accept the land grant, then they are required to take the constitution with it; and, if they reject the land grant, it shall be held and deemed a decision against coming into the Union under the Lecompton constitution. Hence it has been urged in one portion of the Union that this is a submission of the constitution, and in another portion that it is not. We are to be told that submission is popular sovereignty in one section, and submission in another section is not popular sovereignty.

Sir, I had hoped that when we came finally to adjust this question, we should have been able to employ language so clear, so unequivocal, that there would have been no room for doubt as to what was meant, and what the line of policy was to be the future. Are these persons left free to take it or reject the Lecompton constitution? If they accept the land grant, they are compelled to take it. If they reject the land grant, they are out of the Union.

Sir, I have no special objection to the land grant as it is. I think it is a fair one, and if they put this further addition, that if they refused to come in under the Lecompton constitution with the land grant, they might proceed to form a new constitution, and that they should then have the same amount of lands, there would have been no bounty held out for coming in under the Lecompton constitution; but when the law gives them the six million acres in the event they take this constitution, and does not indicate what they are to have in the event they reject it, and wait until they can form another, I submit the question whether there is not an inducement, a bounty held out to influence these people to vote for this Lecompton constitution?

It may be said that when they attain the ninety-three thousand population, or if they wait until after 1860, if they acquired the population required by the then ratio—which may be one hundred and ten thousand or one hundred and twenty thousand—and form a constitution under it, we shall give them the same amount of land that is now given by this grant. That may be so, and may not be so. I believe it will be so; and yet in the House bill, for which this is a substitute, the provision was that they should have a right to it. If they desired an American legislature they had a right to it.

If they desired a Legislature purely Democratic, elected without reference to the question of slavery, it was their right to select such a one; and, Sir, it was the duty of Mr. Calhoun to declare those elected who had received a majority of the legal votes, fairly and honestly returned. The declaration of that result could not change the principle involved in this discussion, for the great principle was, Shall that people be left perfectly and entirely free to form and regulate their own institutions in their own way?

There was no doubt, no uncertainty left in regard to what were to be their rights under the land grant, whether they took the one constitution or the other. Hence that proposition was a fair submission, without any penalties on the one side or any bounty or special privilege on the other to influence their action. In this view of the case, I am not able to arrive at the conclusion that this is a fair submission either of the question of the constitution itself, or of admission into the Union under the constitution, and the proposition submitted by this bill.

Again, sir, there is a further contingency. In the event that they reject this constitution, they are to stay out of the Union until they shall attain the requisite population for a member of Congress according to the then ratio of representation in the other House. I have no objection to making it a general rule that Territories shall be kept out until they have the requisite population. I have proposed it over and over again. I am willing to agree to it and make it applicable to Kansas if you will make it a general rule.

But, sir, it is one thing to adopt that rule as a general rule and adhere to it in all cases, and it is a very different, and a very distinct thing, to provide that if they will take this constitution, which the people have shown that they abhor, they may come in with forty thousand people, but if they do not, they shall stay out until they get ninety thousand, thus discriminating between the different classes of institutions that may be formed. I submit the question whether it is not congressional intervention, when you provide that a territory may come in with one kind of constitution with forty thousand, and with a different kind of constitution, not until she gets ninety thousand, or one hundred and twenty thousand? It is intervention with inducements to control the result. It is intervention with a bounty on the one side and a penalty on the other. I ask, are we prepared to constrain the great principle of popular sovereignty which, I insist, ought to be carried out in all the Territories?

There is no answer to this objection to tell me that because men have conceded so much, I ought to concede. No matter how many and how great their concessions are, if they have not conceded the principles for which I contend, I cannot take what they propose. It is not for me to say whether these concessions are right or wrong, whether they are wise or unwise. It is enough for me that the principles for which I insist has not been clearly and distinctly recognized in this bill. I dislike the indirection by which the submission is proposed to be made—made to depend on a land grant. In order to compel the people of Kansas to reject the Lecompton constitution, you compel them to vote against a land grant, that every man, woman and child in the Territory would desire to have. You will not allow them to take the land grant unless they take the constitution with it, and you will not allow them to proceed immediately and make a new constitution, with the same population, and have the same land grant, if they reject this. If you did that, then the principle would be carried out, but unless you do allow that to be done, I insist that the principle is violated.

The great principle for which we have all contended, in the language of the Kansas-Nebraska act, is to leave "the people perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution of the United States." If you hold out large grants and pecuniary inducements, to influence the affirmative vote, and the terror of staying out of the Union to influence the negative vote, I submit the question, whether that people are left perfectly free to form and regulate their institutions or not? I insist that where there are inducements on one side and penalties on the other, there is no freedom of election. The election must be free. The electors must be left unbiased by the action of the government, if you are going to have fair elections and a fair decision.

For these reasons I do not think that this bill brings the question within that principle, which I have held dear, and in defense of which I have stood here for the last five months, battling against the large majority of my political friends, and in defense of which I intend to stand as long as I have any association with the politics of the country. I must repeat, sir, that I do not think this brings it within the principles thus laid down, nor do the Democracy of Illinois think this bill comes within that principle. We have recently had a State Convention.

Public meetings were held in ninety-eight of the one hundred and odd counties. In ninety-seven of these counties resolutions were passed endorsing the course of the delegation in Congress upon this question. In one county the opposite policy you see sustained. That was the county of Lake, a county where the Republicans have an overwhelming majority—several ten or twenty to one over the Democrats, and where there were just Democrats enough to hold the post-office and the custom-house, and to fill the light-houses. That one county was carried by the Lecompton men, twenty seven of them in number, I think; the other ninety-seven counties being carried by the anti-Lecompton, and in nearly all of them by a nearly unanimous vote. That convention representing the entire State

embodied more of the eminent and distinguished men—men of weight, of character, moral, political and social, than any convention ever assembled in the State.

[Here the Senator quoted the resolutions adopted by the Illinois State Convention.]

I have had appeals made to me from political friends, whom I respect and esteem, imploring me to yield this great principle on this question in consideration of so many concessions being made on the other side. Some of that glorious band of Democrats, who have been acting with me on this question during the session, have felt it their duty to yield, believing as they think, that they have secured a substantial triumph in this great contest. Sir, I desire no personal triumph. I have not stood here for five months in conflict with men with whom I have acted a whole lifetime, struggling for a personal triumph. Hence, because they have made concessions, that fact ought not to change my course, unless those concessions are of such a nature as to give me the principles for which I contend.

If the object was to prove that the Lecompton men had backed down, and abandoned their original ground, I could parade the fact that at the opening of this session we were told that Kansas must come in under the Lecompton constitution unconditionally, or else that four States would secede from the Union. It was then to be unconditional admission. After a while, upon reflection, upon investigation, the conclusion was arrived at that it was wise to put a clause in the bill in some way recognizing the right of the people of that State to change their constitution before 1864, although, according to my construction of its terms, it prohibited any change until that period. Here was a concession made, a great concession, a concession which I never could have made, on which even side of the question I may have been, for the reason that I had not believed that Congress have any right to alter or construe authoritatively a State constitution.

It was not satisfactory to me to have Congress, in pursuance of the recommendation of the President, intervene and recognize, by any implication, the right of the people to change their State constitution in a manner different from that prescribed in the instrument itself. I deny the right of Congress to intervene authoritatively to construe the constitution of a State. If the constitution was their act and deed; if it embodied their will; it was sacred, and it ought not to be touched by Congress in any respect whatever, except to revere it unconditionally, or reject it unconditionally.

That concession was made; but still it did not reach the point which I had felt it my duty to make. It did not come to my principle. I do not claim that Senators are under any mere obligation to come to me, that I am to go to them, I claim the right to determine for myself, according to my own judgment and my own conscience, what my duty is to a great fundamental principle; and if Senators cannot bring the bill within the principle, I must exercise my right and duty of dissenting from it. I did not think that concession brought it within the principle, obviated any of my objections. It only made the bill more obnoxious to me by violating another principle equally sacred in our political system, that of the sovereignty of the States.

Next came the declaration that the free-State Legislature was elected; and hence, if Kansas was forced into the Union with a pro-slavery constitution, against the will of her people, it would not last long, for the reason that there was a free-State Legislature, who would immediately change the constitution to abolish slavery. That argument did not address itself favorably to my judgment, for the reason that it did not affect the principle involved. What difference did it make, so far as the principle was concerned, whether there was a majority of free State men, or a majority of pro-slavery men in that Legislature? What difference did it make to me, whether there was a majority of Democrats, or a majority of Republicans, or a majority of Americans in that Legislature, provided they were fairly and honestly elected? If the people of Kansas desired a pro-slavery Legislature, they had a right to it. The provision was that they should have this same amount of land, whether they came in under the Lecompton constitution, or whether they formed a new constitution.

It may be said that when they attain the ninety-three thousand population, or if they wait until after 1860, if they acquired the population required by the then ratio—which may be one hundred and ten thousand or one hundred and twenty thousand—and form a constitution under it, we shall give them the same amount of land that is now given by this grant. That may be so, and may not be so. I believe it will be so; and yet in the House bill, for which this is a substitute, the provision was that they should have a right to it. If they desired an American legislature they had a right to it.

If they desired a Legislature purely Democratic, elected without reference to the question of slavery, it was their right to select such a one; and, Sir, it was the duty of Mr. Calhoun to declare those elected who had received a majority of the legal votes, fairly and honestly returned.

The declaration of that result could not change the principle involved in this discussion, for the great principle was, Shall that people be left perfectly and entirely free to form and regulate their own institutions in their own way?

These various concessions could not control votes enough to carry the bill. What next? Then comes a disagreement between the two Houses of Congress. The Senate insisting upon the bill which it had passed for the admission of Lecompton unconditionally, except what is called the Green amendment; and the House insisting on the bill which it had passed as a substitute, known as the Crittenden Montgomery bill.

This committee of conference provide for a question of submission to the people, but what do they submit? The Chairman of that committee of conference, the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Green) has informed you that the constitution is not submitted; the Senator from Virginia, (Mr. Hunter,) who was his colleague on the committee, informed you that the constitution is not submitted; and I believe both of them have added that they would not vote for the bill if the constitution was submitted. I understand that similar declarations have been made in the other House of Congress by the members of the committee of conference there, showing that that was their understanding and their construction of this bill.

Then, if the constitution is not submitted; if the people are not allowed to vote for it or against it, freely, without a bounty on the one side or a penalty on the other, how can it be said that it comes within that great principle of popular sovereignty which, I insist, ought to be carried out in all the Territories?

It is no answer to this objection to tell me that because men have conceded so much, I ought to concede. No matter how many and how great their concessions are, if they have not conceded the principles for which I contend, I cannot take what they propose. It is not for me to say whether these concessions are right or wrong, whether they are wise or unwise. It is enough for me that the principles for which I insist has not been clearly and distinctly recognized in this bill.

I dislike the indirection by which the submission is proposed to be made—made to depend on a land grant. In order to compel the people of Kansas to reject the Lecompton constitution, you compel them to vote against a land grant, that every man, woman and child in the Territory would desire to have. You will not allow them to take the land grant unless they take the constitution with it, and you will not allow them to proceed immediately and make a new constitution, with the same population, and have the same land grant, if they reject this. If you did that, then the principle would be carried out, but unless you do allow that to be done, I insist that the principle is violated.

In other words, Mr. President, I desire to carry out the principle of leaving the people to decide for themselves in perfect fairness. I will support no rule applicable to the North that does not apply to the South, I will make no rule applicable to the South that I am not willing to apply to the North. I will not interfere either for slave constitutions or against slave constitutions by an act of Congress, holding out bounties on the one side or penalties on the other. Stand on the great principle of equality; leave each State on an exact footing with every other State; never inquire whether her institutions are of this character or that character; never inquire whether the State is in the North or in the South, and I will stand with you and apply the rule with exact justice and impartiality in every instance.

Mr. President, I say now, as I am about to take leave of this subject, that I never can consent to violate that great principle of State equality, of State sovereignty, of popular sovereignty, by any discrimination, either in the one direction or the other. My position is taken. I know not what its consequences will be personally to me. I will not inquire what these consequences may be. If I cannot remain in public life, holding firmly, immovably, to the great principle of self-government and State equality, I shall go into private life, where I can preserve the respect of my own conscience, under the conviction that I have done my duty, and followed the principle wherever its logical consequences carried me.

Then there would be fairness, then there would be equality.

I appeal to my friend from Virginia to know whether he, as a Southern man, desires to see the principles of congressional intervention to control and influence the voting of the people carried out hereafter in the admission of new States? The time may come when there will be an anti-slavery majority in both Houses of Congress. When that time comes, it may so happen that a bill may be brought forward with a land grant of ten million acres for a free State, and five million for a slave State, or allowing a free State to come in with a population of forty thousand, and providing that a slave State shall not come in without ninety thousand. Would they not say that was the most dangerous and unconstitutional system of intervention that was ever devised, when the Federal Government steps into the Territories, and by its bounties on one side, and its penalties on the other, attempts to influence and control the action of the people?

I do not regard this as a matter of much consequence to Kansas; I do not believe there is enough in this to cause any material influence upon the people of Kansas in this election; but it involves the greatest fundamental principle, it involves the principle of freedom of election, and it involves the protection of the people's right to self-government.

The object was to prove that the Lecompton men had backed down, and abandoned their original ground, I could parade the fact that at the opening of this session we were told that Kansas must come in under the Lecompton constitution unconditionally, or else that four States would secede from the Union. It was then to be unconditional admission. After a while, upon reflection, upon investigation, the conclusion was arrived at that it was wise to put a clause in the bill in some way recognizing the right of the people of that State to change their constitution before 1864, although, according to my construction of its terms, it prohibited any change until that period. Here was a concession made, a great concession, a concession which I never could have made, on which even side of the question I may have been, for the reason that I had not believed that Congress have any right to alter or construe authoritatively a State constitution.

It is the object to yield this great principle on this question in consideration of so many concessions being made on the other side. Some of that glorious band of Democrats, who have been acting with me on this question during the session, have felt it their duty to yield, believing as they think, that they have secured a substantial triumph in this great contest. Sir, I desire no personal triumph.

I have not stood here for five months in conflict with men with whom I have acted a whole lifetime, struggling for a personal triumph.

Hence, because they have made concessions,

they will not say that was the most dangerous and unconstitutional system of intervention that was ever devised, when the Federal Government steps into the Territories, and by its bounties on one side, and its penalties on the other, attempts to influence and control the action of the people?

I do not regard this as a matter of much consequence to Kansas; I do not believe there is enough in this to cause any material influence upon the people of Kansas in this election; but it involves the greatest fundamental principle, it involves the principle of freedom of election, and it involves the protection of the people's right to self-government.

The object was to prove that the Lecompton men had backed down, and abandoned their original ground, I could parade the fact that at the opening of this session we were told that Kansas must come in under the Lecompton constitution unconditionally, or else that four States would secede from the Union. It was then to be unconditional admission. After a while, upon reflection, upon investigation, the conclusion was arrived at that it was wise to put a clause in the bill in some way recognizing the right of the people of that State to change their constitution before 1864, although, according to my construction of its terms, it prohibited any change until that period. Here was a concession made, a great concession, a concession which I never could have made, on which even side of the question I may have been, for the reason that I had not believed that Congress have any right to alter or construe authoritatively a State constitution.

It is the object to yield this great principle on this question in consideration of so many concessions being made on the other side. Some of that glorious band of Democrats, who have been acting with me on this question during the session, have felt it their duty to yield, believing as they think, that they have secured a substantial triumph in this great contest. Sir, I desire no personal triumph.

I have not stood here for five months in conflict with men with whom I have acted a whole lifetime, struggling for a personal triumph.

Hence, because they have made concessions,

they will not say that was the most dangerous and unconstitutional system of intervention that was ever devised, when the Federal Government steps into the Territories, and by its bounties on one side, and its penalties on the other, attempts to influence and control the action of the people?

I do not regard this as a matter of much consequence to Kansas; I do not believe there is enough in this to cause any material influence upon the people of Kansas in this election; but it involves the greatest fundamental principle, it involves the principle of freedom of election, and it involves the protection of the people's right to self-government.

The object was to prove that the Lecompton men had backed down, and abandoned their original ground, I could parade the fact that at the opening of this session we were told that Kansas must come in under the Lecompton constitution unconditionally, or else that four States would secede from the Union. It was then to be unconditional admission. After a while, upon reflection, upon investigation, the conclusion was arrived at that it was wise to put a clause in the bill in some way recognizing the right of the people of that State to change their constitution before 1864, although, according to my construction of its terms, it prohibited any change until that period. Here was a concession made, a great concession, a concession which I never could have made, on which even side of the question I may have been, for the reason that I had not believed that Congress have any right to alter or construe authoritatively a State constitution.

It is the object to yield this great principle on this question in consideration of so many concessions being made on the other side. Some of that glorious band of Democrats, who have been acting with me on this question during the session, have felt it their duty to yield, believing as they think, that they have secured a substantial triumph in this great contest. Sir, I desire no personal triumph.

I have not stood here for five months in conflict with men with whom I have acted a whole lifetime, struggling for a personal triumph.

Hence, because they have made concessions,

they will not say that was the most dangerous and unconstitutional system of intervention that was ever devised, when the Federal Government steps into the Territories, and by its bounties on one side, and its penalties on the other, attempts to influence and control the action of the people?

I do not regard this as a matter of much consequence to Kansas; I do not believe there is enough in this to cause any material influence upon the people of Kansas in this election; but it involves the greatest fundamental principle, it involves the principle of freedom of election, and it involves the protection of the people's right to self-government.

The object was to prove that the Lecompton men had backed down, and abandoned their original ground, I could parade the fact that at the opening of this session we were told that Kansas must come in under the Lecompton constitution unconditionally, or else that four States would secede from the Union. It was then to be unconditional admission. After a while, upon reflection, upon investigation, the conclusion was arrived at that it was wise to put a clause in the bill in some way recognizing the right of the people of that State to change their constitution before 1864, although, according to my construction of its terms, it prohibited any change until that period. Here was a concession made, a great concession, a concession which I never could have made, on which even side of the question I may have been, for the reason that I had not believed that Congress have any right to alter or construe authoritatively a State constitution.

It is the object to yield this great principle on this question in consideration of so many concessions being made on the other side. Some of that glorious band of Democrats, who have been acting with me on this question during the session, have felt it their duty to yield, believing as they think, that they have secured a substantial triumph in this great contest. Sir, I desire no personal triumph.

I have not stood here for five months in conflict with men with

THE COMMONWEALTH.

FRANKFORT.

THOMAS M. GREEN, Editor.

MONDAY.....MAY 24, 1858.

AUGUST ELECTION, 1858.

FOR CLERK OF THE COURT OF APPEALS,
HON. GEORGE R. MCKEE,
OF PULASKI COUNTY.

COUNTY NOMINATIONS.

FOR SHERIFF,
HARRY I. TODD.

FOR COUNTY COURT JUDGE,
JOHN M. HARLAN.

FOR COUNTY COURT CLERK,
ALEXANDER H. RENNICK.

FOR JAILER,
HARRY R. MILLER.

FOR COUNTY ATTORNEY,
JAMES MONROE.

FOR CORONER,
JOHN R. GRAHAM.

FOR ASSESSOR,
WILLIAM F. PARRENT.

FOR COUNTY SURVEYOR,
WILLIAM E. ARNOLD.

Democracy and the Lecompton Test.
There has been no end to the abuse and detraction which the administration Democracy of this State have heaped upon those Americans who refused to support the President in his Kansas policy. John J. Crittenden and Humphrey Marshall, two men who are as firm and loyal to the interests of the South as any that ever breathed, and W. L. Underwood, one of the largest slave holders in the State, and who is known not only to be a strong pro slavery man but also a propagandist—all these men, and many others of kindred tone and sentiment, have been proclaimed to be traitors to the South, and have been denounced as Abolitionists by men who have no interest in the question of slavery, and who would be vehement and rank Abolitionists themselves if such a doctrine only suited the localities in which they live. These same Southern Democratic papers have denounced Stephen A. Douglas, Walker, Forney, and other distinguished Northern Democrats for the same cause—their hardihood in resisting the encroachments of the Executive and the Congress upon the rights of the people. These men have been called Abolitionists, and it has been repeatedly said in this State that Kentucky should place her armed heel upon them, simply because they desired that the people of Kansas should have an opportunity of deciding what should be their organic law. But even while Southern Democrats denounce John J. Crittenden and Humphrey Marshall for having as they allege, betrayed the South, they forget, or at least they fail to announce, that Henry A. Wise of Virginia holds identically the same position and has proclaimed and defended it more pertinaciously and fiercely than any man in the country. And yet this does not in their opinion impair the Democracy of Wise, nor does it prevent him from being as formerly the chosen champion of Southern rights. If any one were to charge Wise with Abolitionism, for agreeing with Crittenden, these same Southern Democrats would be the first to denounce him as a liar and scoundrel. While they denounce Forney as an Abolitionist for opposing the President and advocating the Crittenden substitute, they fail to mark the course of the Richmond *Enquirer*, the New Orleans *Delta* and the New Orleans *Courier*, which have been and are the stanchest pro slavery papers in the country, but which occupy identically the position as that assumed by Forney.

After all the fuss which has been made in Kentucky about Lecompton, after all the denunciation of Crittenden on account of his substitute, after all the abuse of McKee on account of his endorsement of Crittenden, and after every endeavor to make the Lecompton Constitution the test question in the race for the Clerkship of the Court of Appeals,—after all this, the Democratic Convention which met at Lebanon to nominate a candidate for Judge of the Court of Appeals received into full fellowship John H. Harney, the editor of the Louisville *Democrat*, and who has been denounced from one end of the State to the other as a rank Black Republican. Mr. Harney took bolder ground, perhaps, than any man in Kentucky against the Lecompton Constitution, and gallantly took his stand by the side of Crittenden and Marshall, in what these Democratic editors were pleased to denounce as a coalition with Abolitionism, but it does not prevent him from taking a prominent part in a Democratic nominating Convention. Joshua F. Bullitt is also known to be an anti Lecompton man, and yet he too figured conspicuously among the Democrats who nominated Wood. But the strangest circumstance of all is that this Democratic Convention adjourned without passing any resolutions either endorsing or repudiating the President's course. Now why was this? It was because the Democracy knew that it would create a serious split in their ranks, and they preferred to unite upon the spoils even if they do divide upon principles afterwards. It would have proved a dangerous experiment for an adventurous Democrat to have introduced into that Convention a resolution endorsing the Kansas policy of the President, as it would have excluded Harney, Bullitt, and many other influential Democrats who could not conscientiously have supported it. It would have produced a discussion, and a discussion of this question among members of their own party is what Southern Democratic leaders are especially anxious to avoid. It requires no great power of penetration to see that the Lecomptonites have been most shamefully bullied in the Lebanon Convention. The anti-Lecomptonites, although not in the majority, still mustered so strongly that the friends of the administration dared not repudiate them, even though their organs have repeatedly branded them as Abolitionists. Without the aid of those Democrats who agree with Crittenden and repudiate the President, the Democracy would not have the least possible chance of success. They are obliged to depend for victory

upon those whom they have read out of the party, and whom they have vilified as traitors to the South, in sentiment if not in deed. They draw to their bosoms these anti-Lecompton Democrats of the South, just as they embrace John Van Buren, Dix, Cochrane, and hosts of other free soil Democrats in the North. Their aid is necessary in order to enable the Democracy to obtain office, and it matters not to the leaders what may be their principles so that their votes are given to the Democratic nominee.

This action of the Democrats at Lebanon more than convinces us that the leaders of the Democracy in Kentucky care not for the slavery question, or any other question, any further than they can be used to further their own ambitious designs. They use questions of State and national policy as so many hobbies on which to ride into office, and do not desire office for the sake of carrying out certain principles of government. The principle, or rather the want of principle, is used by them as the stepping-stone—as the means by which to obtain political advancement—and not as the goal to be reached, not as the great object to be sought for. The Lecompton question is said by Locofoco organs to be the vital question before the people of Kentucky and the South, that any man who flinches upon it is a traitor to the best interests of Kentucky and should be promptly crushed, that all who do not endorse the President are Abolitionists and enemies of the country. And yet the Democracy meet in solemn assembly to make a party nomination and to express their party views, and fail to express any opinion whatever upon a question which they appear to deem so important. And they admit in Convention and meet as brothers, men who have opposed the policy assumed by Southern Democrats in Congress, and who have thus, to use the favorite argument of the Lexington *Statesman*, "deprived the South of the moral prestige of an undivided front." We think we are justified, then, in supposing that it is really of no importance to the Democracy what may be the opinions of any one upon the Lecompton Constitution, if Democrats are permitted to slip into all the offices. When it is necessary to get an office, the Democracy will endorse the President straight out; where it is necessary to unite both wings of the divided Democracy, they will ignore the question; and when it will avail them, they will turn against it and support Crittenden. We may be mistaken, but we religiously believe that a large majority of the Democratic leaders in this State would turn Emancipationists or ultra-Abolitionists if they could fill their own pockets or in any way advance their own or their party's interest by so doing.

The Richmond Enquirer vs. the President.

The Richmond *Enquirer*, that staunch old States-right paper, blows a blast from its bugle as cheerfully as any that have been sent forth by Forney or any of the opponents of the present administration. It is well known that this paper did more towards the success of Buchanan in the South than any other organ of the Democracy, but it has the courage and independence to rebuke him as soon as he has exhibited an inclination to return to his old Federal positions. Of course the *Enquirer* will be set down among the Abolitionists, and we fear that before long every respectable journal in the South will be in the same category, leaving the Administration to be defended only by a few mushroom concerns whom they can bribe to see as they do. We will stand by the *Enquirer*, the New Orleans *Delta*, and other Southern pro-slavery Democratic papers in this issue, and let the whipper-snappers charge Abolitionism upon us to their hearts' content. We, for one, are not to be frightened from the advocacy of the right and of justice by every demagogue who chooses to raise the cry of "the South, the South." But hear the *Enquirer*:

"We have been utterly opposed to the immediate admission to the Union of the Territory of Kansas, under the so-called Constitution, framed at Lecompton, in November last. We still believe that the Constitutional Convention, although legitimately assembled, resorted to a means of submission of the Constitution entirely at variance with republican principle and sanctioned by no precedent of republican history. We cannot recognize that this Constitution has either been formally or virtually adopted, either by the Convention at Lecompton or by the people of Kansas. We consider that the mode of submission to was intended to defeat, and did defeat, all fair expression of that popular will to which the schedule of submission professed to defer. Under these circumstances we agreed with a large number of the Democratic party, by insisting that a Constitution, legally framed, should also be legally adopted, before it could be imposed by Congressional action upon a sovereign people; that the Lecompton Constitution should be submitted to a full, fair, free submission to the people, who should thus be enabled to elect its ratification or rejection."

[From the Leavenworth City Ledger, May 7th.]

We have too much confidence in the people of Kansas to believe that they will accept any such proposition. We believe that they would rather remain a Territory eternally, than to come into the Union under such insulting and degrading conditions. What! be bought up like a flock of sheep? Sacrifice our principles, for the triumph of which we have so earnestly waited, for a fine slice of the public lands? Away with such an idea!

[From the Quindaro Chindowan, May 8th.]

The flat of the people is just as surely pronounced as though it had been heralded by trumpet voices from every hill-top that diversifies our beautiful prairies. No new manifesto need be made. The unfair submission of the Lecompton Constitution will not shield it; the people will strike through the ordinance to bury the lance of their just indignation deep in the heart of the swindle.

The Kansas correspondent of the St. Louis "Republican" also says:

"It is now pretty much settled that the Democrats of Kansas are to vote, unite with the conservative, anti-nigger free soilers, and kill the Leavenworth bastard on the 18th inst. I consider it good policy, and the prospect is that the thing will be overwhelmingly defeated, as it ought to be. There is almost as much excitement on this topic as there used to be on Lecompton. It shows that there are some people in Kansas, who, if they lost their sense once, have found and got them back again."

The Death of H. W. HERBERT.—The death of Mr. Herbert, by his own hand, was mentioned in our paper of yesterday, together with some particulars. He left two letters—one addressed to the press of the United States, and one to the coroner of New York. The former contains nothing of interest. The latter throws some light on his motives for the suicide, and we give it:

[Louisville Journal.]

TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1858.

(Three months since the happiest days of my life.)

To avoid all trouble and simplify your duty, I have to state that I have taken my own life by a pistol shot, no one being privy to my doing so or to my design.

My reason for this act consists in no remorse for anything I have done or left undone; from no pecuniary pressure, from no inability or fear of safety to support myself, from no weak fear of public opinion, least of all public opinion of Newark, which I do now, as I always have done, utterly disregard and despise; from no embarrassment arising from any indebtedness.

I have abundance of employment, and the prospect of much more—had the people of Newark whom I forgive from the bottom of my heart suffered me to live harmlessly and happily in my humble home, and to amend my life where it was an error, in a new sphere which I was honestly prepared to do, I might have paid off all my debts, and lived many years among you, an honest, useful, and happy man. My debts will be paid from my assets, to the last dollar.

It was not, however, so to be; my blood and the guilt of it is upon those women and men of Newark who first sowed suspicion, distrust, and dissension b-tween myself and the sweetest creature God ever gave, and man took away from an unhappy sinner. My own unhappy temper did the rest.

The reason for this act, then, is single. My life, long, sad, and solitary and weary, and without an object, has been utterly hopeless, hateful, and insipid.

A hope had been kindled in my heart again—my home had got a light in it brighter than

About "Bundling" and the Stouts.
The Buffalo *Express* thus speaks of the fact that Ira Stout and his sister, Mrs. Littles, occupied at times the same bed:

"We cannot help thinking that great injustice has been done to Ira Stout and his sister, Mrs. Littles, and in fact to the whole of that family, by the opinion which had been so persistently urged, that the condemned murderer and his sister were guilty of criminal intercourse. We have seen no proof of any such intercourse, nor anything which would bear any such construction, further than that on one or two occasions, far apart, they had occupied the same bed, which in our judgment is far from being conclusive as regards the crime of which, by common consent, they seem to be pronounced guilty. Among a certain class of people, and Dutch residents of the Mohawk, Pennsylvania and New York, for instance, the practice of "bundling," as it is termed, is still kept up, although not quite so extensively as formerly, and the occupation of the same bed by brothers and sisters, and between unmarried lovers, so far from being regarded as an evidence of guilt, is insisted upon, especially in the latter case, as a time-honored custom—an act of hospitality and esteem and regard which is as far from guilt as the most innocent intercourse between children. The custom, we believe, originated in Wales, where in past time it was universal. All those who have had occasion to live among this class of people, not later than 20 or 30 years ago, well know how common a usage "bundling" was among them.

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school, or church, and to "bundle," i. e., to "turn it" in the same bed together, was as much a matter of course, as for down-easters to "sit up and spark it" until cock crow in the morning. Strangers to the custom were always urged as a matter of course, by the father and mother of the girl, to comply with it, and the instances are rare indeed where any immoral consequences resulted from it."

For a young lady to accept of an escort home from singing or spelling school,

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
GLASGOW FREE PRESS.**

GLASGOW, KY., December 23, 1857.

Dear Sir.—Having disposed of our Printing Office in Elizabethtown, Ky., we are now located at Glasgow, and view it as our duty to let the world know our purpose in commencing the publication of a newspaper sometime during the month of February, to be entitled "THE GLASGOW FREE PRESS." It will be devoted to General Literature, and especially to the promotion of the advancement of the local and general interests of the town and county, and those adjacent. No pains or exertion on our part will be interdicted to secure due consideration for all local enterprises, which may be calculated to advance the welfare of the country.

An earnest effort will be made to render it a valuable family newspaper, acceptable to all parties, combining a variety of interesting and instructive subjects in its columns. Having had considerable experience in business, and especially family work with its mechanical parts, we indulge the hope that we shall be enabled to subscribe to some extent, the interests to which the "FREE PRESS" will be dedicated.

American Politics at the present time, we are said very justly, are the great perplexities of the day. We do not sign our name to the Prospects to enter the domain of speculation. It is not necessary to the present purpose, or to define our political position. This may be defined very briefly. We are conscientiously opposed to the practices and the present system of Democracy. We regard the Democratic party, as now constituted, essentially an alien party; and consider its aims and purposes, as avowed by its organs, practiced by its leaders, and developed in the present administration, pregnant with evil to the Union, in violation of the plain principles of the early fathers, and discreditable to American Nationality.

We recognize in the "Address of the American Party," promulgated at the Louisville Convention, a political creed, eminent national, eminently conservative, and peculiarly adapted to present exigencies. We believe that they are the true principles that organization may be found the panacea for many, if not all, the political evils, which have discredited the country and fomented sectional strife, and which it is now in evident contemplation to aggravate by unwise and impudent legislation.

While we shall aim to be perfectly independent and honest in the expression of our views of public men and measures, we shall studiously observe courtesy and a proper respect for the opinions of others, whose convictions may lead them to differ with us. We shall rally around us, and every one the "free and untrammeled expression of his opinions." In no other government is this perfect freedom of opinion in the citizen tolerated, or considered compatible with the dignity of the State. Our wife's system of government rests upon this basis. Public opinion is here at once the source and the support of power. We cherish an appreciation of the great privilege, too exalted, to induce us to refuse to others what we are prompt to claim for ourselves. Hence the column of the "Free Press" will always be open to well written, courteous articles, even though they may conflict with individual opinions.

We invoke, in aid our enterprise, the support and patronage of the citizens of the surrounding counties, especially those whose opinions may harmonize with the general views herein expressed.

We send you this circular, hoping that you may feel inclined to give us the benefit of your influence, in procuring a list of subscribers in your locality, by the 1st day of February, 1858.

TERMS.

The "FREE PRESS" will be published weekly, on new and beautiful type, at the following rates:

Single copy, one year, (Invariably in advance) \$8.00

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

If any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!

The first number of the "LITERARY JOURNAL" will be issued the 1st of March, 1858, and each succeeding number will be issued the first of each month, for a period of twelve months, at \$1.00 per number.

McHANEY, at \$3, per annum, invariably in advance.

To clubs of 10, and upwards, \$1.50

Any one procuring a club of Ten subscribers, will receive an extra copy.

SMITH & PARKER, Proprietors.

**PROSPECTUS
OF THE
MONTHLY LITERARY
JOURNAL.**

Useful, Interesting, and Instructive!